

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended. Claims 2 and 11 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 6-9, 14, and 15 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, 10, 11-13, and 16 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 4, 13, and 16 have been amended responsive to this rejection. If any further amendment is necessary to overcome this rejection, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12-13, and 16 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,727,869 to Kosaka ("Kosaka"). It is noted that claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended. To the extent that the rejection remains applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejection as follows.

The Applicants submit that Kosaka does not disclose or suggest a plasma display panel with barrier ribs configured in a closed shape comprising at least the combination of a plurality of sustain electrodes each spaced apart in a row direction at a predetermined cell length, wherein said plurality of sustain electrodes substantially align

with the barrier ribs in a row direction and are substantially the same width as the barrier rib in the row direction; and a plurality of data electrodes overlapping a wall of said barrier ribs in a column direction, each of said data electrodes extending under said cell area, wherein the data electrode substantially aligns with the barrier rib in the column direction and is substantially the same width as the barrier rib in the column direction, and wherein a gap is formed between said barrier ribs in a row direction and said data electrodes, and said gap is positive or negative, wherein said gap is less than 45% of the cell length, as recited in amended claim 1.

In contrast, Kosaka teaches address electrode A1 being substantially wider than column barrier 29, and including further protrusions Apad. It is only between these protrusions, which do not align substantially with the column barrier 29, and the row barrier ribs 19 that a gap is formed. This is not the structure recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, the sustain electrodes X_1 , Y_1 of Kosaka are shown as being located between the barrier ribs in a row direction 19, and being substantially wider than barrier ribs 19.

In addition, the Office Action admits that Kosaka does not expressly disclose that a gap between the barrier ribs and the data electrodes is less than 40% of the cell length. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious based on Figs. 8 and 12 for one of skill in the art to make a display with the claimed gap length to ensure proper discharge of the last pixel in which the data electrode is present. The Examiner asserts that "40% is seen as an optimum range that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made."

MPEP § 2144.05B clarifies that a particular parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable before the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of the variable might be characterized as routine experimentation. The present application first discloses that forming the claimed structure with a gap of less than 45% of the cell length between the data electrodes and barrier ribs reduces discharge error and image flicker in a display. Kosaka does not recognize or disclose such benefits in connection with a gap between data electrodes and barrier ribs. Thus, Kosaka does not disclose that the gap length parameter is a result effective variable, and the optimization of the gap length parameter would not have been obvious based on the teachings of Kosaka.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. For similar reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 10 and 16 are likewise allowable. As claims 1 and 10 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 3-5 and 12-13, which depend from allowable claims 1 and 10, are therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reason and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 025789-00010.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sheree Rowe".

Sheree Rowe
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,068

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395